

1 JOHN F. MURTHA, ESQ.
2 **Nevada Bar No. 835**
3 BRENOCH R. WIRTHLIN, ESQ.
4 **Nevada Bar No. 10282**
5 WOODBURN AND WEDGE
6 Sierra Plaza
7 6100 Neil Road, Ste. 500
8 Post Office Box 2311
9 Reno, Nevada 89505
10 Telephone: 775-688-3000
11 Facsimile : 775-688-3088

12 jmurtha@woodburnandwedge.com

13 Attorneys for Trustee
14 Angelique L.M. Clark

15 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
16 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

17 * * *

18 In re:

19 Case No. BK-08-51131-GWZ
20 Chapter 7

21 CETUS MORTGAGE, LTD.

22 Debtor.
23 _____/

24 ANGELIQUE L.M. CLARK,
25 TRUSTEE,

26 Adv. No. _____

27 Plaintiff,

28 **COMPLAINT TO AVOID TRANSFERS
PURSUANT TO 11 USC §§ 544, 547(b),
548(a) AND/OR NRS § 112.180**

vs.

29 WILLIAM E. BECKER and
30 SHARON L. BECKER, Trustees
31 of the Becker Family Trust,

32 Defendant.
33 _____/

1 Plaintiff Angelique L.M. Clark, Trustee, by and through her counsel Woodburn
2 and Wedge complains and alleges as follows:
3

4 I

5 **PARTIES, JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6 1. This case presents claims that arise under Title 11 USC and, therefore,
7 this Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to the provisions of 28 USC §
8 1334(b).

9 2. This matter presents issues relating to the determination, avoidance and
10 recovery of preferential transfers and fraudulent conveyances and, therefore, the claims
11 alleged herein are core proceedings under the provisions of 28 USC § 157(b)(2)(F) and
12 (H).
13

14 3. This Court is a proper venue for this case under the provisions of 28 USC
15 § 1409(a).

16 4. Plaintiff Angelique L.M. Clark ("Clark") is the duly appointed trustee of the
17 Chapter 7 bankruptcy estate of Cetus Mortgage, Ltd. ("Cetus") pending before this Court
18 as Case No. BK-08-51131 ("Bankruptcy").
19

20 5. The named Defendant ("Defendant") conducted business with Cetus within
21 Washoe County, Nevada, and the claims asserted herein relate to such business
22 activities.

23 6. Clark is uncertain whether the Defendant's full legal name, the nature of
24 the Defendant's existence (corporation, partnership, limited liability company, etc.) and
25 the named Trustee(s) of the Trust, if applicable, are correct and, therefore, reserves the
26

1 right to amend this Complaint at the appropriate time to properly identify any defendant
2 that may not be properly named or designated.
3

4 II

5 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

6 7. At all times relevant to the matters alleged herein, Cetus was a Nevada
7 corporation doing business in Washoe County, Nevada.

8 8. Cetus was licensed as a mortgage company by the Mortgage Lending
9 Division of the State of Nevada Department of Business and Industry and was engaged in
10 the business of brokering and servicing loans secured by residential and commercial
11 properties located mostly in Northern Nevada.
12

13 9. Typically, loans brokered by Cetus were funded by investments solicited
14 from third party investors willing to loan funds to Cetus borrowers. The loans brokered by
15 Cetus were occasionally funded by a single investor, but in most instances the loans were
16 funded with monies pooled from a group of investors.
17

18 10. In July 2008, the State of Nevada, Department of Business and Industry,
19 Division of Mortgage Lending seized Cetus' assets on the basis of several complaints from
20 investors that Cetus had:

- 21 A. Forged signatures on property conveyances;
22 B. Altered property descriptions in deeds of trust without proper
23 authorization;
24 C. Failed to properly account for investors' funds; and
25 D. Committed other violations of law.

26 ///
27
28

1 11. Cetus allowed its Nevada mortgage company license to expire without
2 renewal on June 30, 2008.

3
4 12. Cetus filed a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the United
5 States Bankruptcy Code with this Court on July 9, 2008, commencing the above captioned
6 Bankruptcy.

7 13. On July 17, 2008, Clark was appointed Trustee of Cetus' bankruptcy estate
8 pursuant to the provisions of 11 USC § 1104. Cetus' Chapter 11 case was converted to
9 Chapter 7 proceedings on August 19, 2008, and Clark was subsequently appointed
10 Trustee of Cetus' Chapter 7 estate.

11
12 14. Pursuant to 11 USC § 704, one of the duties of bankruptcy trustees is to
13 investigate the financial affairs of the debtor. Clark has investigated, and continues to
14 investigate, Cetus' financial affairs. To date, Clark's investigation has revealed, among
15 other things, that:

- 16 A. Contrary to Nevada State law and regulations governing mortgage
17 companies, Cetus commingled investors' funds;
- 18 B. Cetus used monies invested by lenders for purposes other than for which
19 they were invested; and
- 20 C. Cetus, in some instances, failed to repay investors when loans they funded
21 were paid in full by the borrowers and, instead, used the repayment funds to
22 pay other investor claims or fund its operations. In turn, Cetus used other
23 investors' investment funds to continue to pay interest to the prior investors
to make it appear borrowers were still making interest payments on the
loans.

24 15. Based upon her investigations to date, Clark alleges that Cetus was
25 engaged in a phony investment scheme in which:

26 ///
27
28

- A. Monies paid by later investors were, at times, used to pay returns on investments to earlier investors while no actual return had been received on behalf of the earlier investors;
- B. Monies that properly belonged to certain investors were used to continue to pay interest on investments made by other investors in an attempt to cover up the fact the other investors' loans had gone into default; and
- C. Monies invested by later investors was used to fund prior loans from which Cetus had improperly diverted funds to cover up the fact loan funds had been misused.

16. Clark alleges that Cetus engaged in the phony investment activities referenced in Paragraph 14, above, for the purpose of causing investors, old and new, to continue to invest with Cetus, i.e. Cetus was engaged in a Ponzi scheme.

III

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Preference—11 USC §547(b))

17. Clark repeats each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 16, above, and incorporates the same herein as if set forth in their entirety.

18. Based upon information available from Cetus' books and records, Clark is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that from and after April 10, 2008, and up until Cetus filed for bankruptcy relief, it made the following payments to the Defendant:

DATE	CHECK NO	AMOUNT
04/22/2008	96694	\$1,500.00
04/25/2008	96765	\$1,237.50
04/25/2008	96807	\$1,312.50
05/01/2008	96951	\$1,200.00
05/01/2008	96977	\$1,041.67
05/08/2008	97148	\$937.50
05/15/2008	97333	\$1,500.00
05/22/2008	97457	\$1,237.50
05/29/2008	97586	\$1,312.50
05/29/2008	97596	\$1,200.00

05/29/2008	97646	\$1,041.67
06/06/2008	97724	\$937.50
06/13/2008	97875	\$1,500.00
06/13/2008	97893	\$3,375.00

19. At the time the payments set forth in Paragraph 18, above, were made the Defendant was a creditor of Cetus for purposes of 11 USC §547(b)(1).

20. The payments referenced in Paragraph 18, above, were for or on account of an antecedent debt owed by Cetus before the payments were made.

21. Cetus was insolvent at the time it made the payments referenced in Paragraph 18, above.

22. The payments referenced in Paragraph 18, above, were made on or within ninety (90) days before Cetus filed its Chapter 11 petition in this matter.

23. Should the Defendant be allowed to retain the payments referenced in Paragraph 18, above, it would receive more than it would otherwise receive if (a) this case were a chapter 7 case under Title 11; (b) the transfer had not been made; and (c) it received payment of such debt to the extent provided by Title 11.

24. The payments referenced in Paragraph 18, above, constitute preferences pursuant to the provisions of 11 USC §547(b) that may be avoided by this Court.

Wherefore, Clark prays for relief as hereinafter set forth.

IV

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Fraudulent Transfers—11 USC §548(a)(1)(A))

25. Clark repeats each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 24, above, and incorporates the same herein as if set forth in their entirety.

Wherefore, Clark prays for relief as hereinafter set forth.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
(Fraudulent Transfers—NRS §112.180(1)(a))

35. Pursuant to 11 USC §544, Clark has the rights and powers of a lien creditor and as a successor to certain creditors and purchasers which provides her with standing to bring any fraudulent transfer actions that may exist under non-bankruptcy law.

37. Cetus made the Excess Transfers listed in Paragraph 36, above, with actual intent to hinder, delay, or defraud its creditors.

Wherefore, Clark prays for relief as follows:

///

1 A. For an order voiding the payments referenced in Paragraph 15 as
2 preferential transfers under the provisions of 11 USC §577(b)(1);

3
4 B. For an order voiding the Excess Transfers referenced in Paragraph 26 as
5 fraudulent transfers under the provisions of 11 USC § 548(a)(1)(A);

6 C. For an order voiding the Excess Transfers referenced in Paragraph 26 as
7 fraudulent transfers under the provisions of 11 USC § 548(a)(1)(B);

8 D. For an order voiding the Excess Transfers referenced in Paragraph 36 as
9 fraudulent transfers under the provisions of NRS §112.180(1)(a);

10 E. For judgment against the Defendant, or any immediate or mediate
11 transferee of any preferential payment or fraudulent transfer, in an amount to be proven at
12 the trial in this matter, as provided in 11 USC §550;

13 F. For an award of costs incurred in connection with the prosecution of this
14 matter;

15 G. For an award of attorneys' fees incurred in connection with the prosecution
16 of this matter; and

17 H. For such other and further relief as to this Court is necessary or appropriate
18 under the circumstances.

19
20 DATED this 30th day of June, 2010.

21
22
23 WOODBURN and WEDGE

24
25 By 

26 John F. Murtha, Esq.
27 Attorneys for Trustee
28 Angelique L.M. Clark